

Mar 20 03 11:32a

P. 2

1 1) The Petitioner submits a small entity Petition fee of \$650.00 pursuant to 37
2 CFR 1.17(l).

3 2) The Petitioner submits a response to the Examiner's Action of August 16,
4 2000.

5 3) the Petitioner asserts that there is no terminal disclaimer required as this
6 application was filed on or after June 8, 1995.

7 4) the Petitioner submits Petitioner's statement that the entire delay was
8 unintentional. The entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the
9 required reply until the filing of a grantable petition under 37CFR 1.137(b) was
10 unintentional.

11

12

13

March 16, 2003

Max V. Weiss

14

15

March 20, 2003

Terry J. Cullinan

16

RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S ACTION OF AUGUST 16, 2000

17 The following substitute specification for application 09/041,685, entitled A BIO-
18 REACTIVE GREASE AND OIL SEPARATOR, is submitted. The substitute
19 specification, the claim amendments and the remarks are responsive to the Final Office
20 Action dated August 16, 2000 wherein the Examiner states that the substitute
21 specification filed April 11, 2000 has not been entered because it does not conform to
22 MPEP 608.01(q) which requires the submission of a marked-up copy which shows
23 additions to and/or deletions from the original specification and that said proffered
24 substitute specification does not conform to 35 CFR 1.125 which requires that applicants
25 certify that there is no new matter, and moreover, the specification is not entered because
26

27

28

Certificate of facsimile filing
on March 16, 2003 by Lloyd E. Ivey.

Application No. 09/041,685

28

Mar-20-03 13:16 Weiss, Research

406 8 2283

P.01

- 1 1) The Petitioner submits a small entity Petition fee of \$650.00 pursuant to 37
- 2 CFR 1.17(l).
- 3 2) The Petitioner submits a response to the Examiner's Action of August 16, 2000
- 4 in the form of a Continued Prosecution Application.
- 5 3) the Petitioner asserts that there is no terminal disclaimer required as this
- 6 application was filed on or after June 8, 1995.
- 7 4) the Petitioner submits Petitioner's statement that the entire delay was
- 8 unintentional. The entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the
- 9 required reply until the filing of a grantable petition under 37CFR 1.137(b) was
- 10 unintentional.

11 *March 18, 2003*
12 March 18, 2003

Max V. Weiss
Max V. Weiss

14 **CONTINUED PROSECUTION APPLICATION**

15 The following Continued Prosecution Application of application 09/041,685,
16 entitled A BIO-REACTIVE GREASE AND OIL SEPARATOR, is submitted. The
17 amendment and the remarks are responsive to the Final Office Action dated August 16,
18 2000 wherein the Examiner states that the substitute specification filed April 11, 2000 has
19 not been entered because it does not conform to MPEP 608.01(q) which requires the
20 submission of a marked-up copy which shows additions to and/or deletions from the
21 original specification and that said proffered substitute specification does not conform to
22 35 CFR 1.125 which requires that applicants certify that there is no new matter, and
23 moreover, the specification is not entered because it is replete with new matter.

24 Your applicant submits the following as a substitute specification flowing from
25 the reordering of that which was submitted as the original application. This Continued

26 Certificate of facsimile filing
27 on March 18, 2003 by Floyd E. Ivey.

Application No. 09/041,685